



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/699,660

11/04/2003

Ching-Hui Chen

32052-8567.US

6469

25096

7590

02/24/2009

PERKINS COIE LLP

PATENT-SEA

P.O. BOX 1247

SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER

STOREY, WILLIAM C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/24/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/699,660	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner WILLIAM C. STOREY	Art Unit 2625	

All Participants:

(1) WILLIAM C. STOREY.

(2) Cameron Pilling.

Date of Interview: 18 February 2009

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: ~1:30 PM E.S.T

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/William C Storey/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner previously noted that it appeared that proposed amendments submitted by the applicant appeared to overcome the previous application of the references used in rejection of claim 22. However, after further thought, the examiner felt that specifying that first and second regions were to be laterally adjacent (or something of that nature) to preclude the possibility of the two regions on top of each other would provide a better chance of overcoming the previous application of the references. Any amendments will be fully considered when submitted formally for examination..